

The following publication Li, David C. S., Aoyama, Reiji and Wong, Tak-sum. "Silent conversation through Brushtalk (筆談): The use of Sinitic as a scripta franca in early modern East Asia" *Global Chinese*, vol. 6, no. 1, 2020, pp. 1-24 is available at <https://dx.doi.org/10.1515/glochi-2019-0027>. The final publication is available at www.degruyter.com.

Silent Conversation through Brushtalk (筆談): The Use of Sinitic as a Scripta Franca in Early Modern East Asia

David C. S. Li, Reiji Aoyama, and Wong Tak-Sum

(To appear in *Global Chinese*)

ABSTRACT

Literary Sinitic (written Chinese, hereafter Sinitic) functioned as a 'scripta franca' in sinographic East Asia, which broadly comprises China, Japan, South Korea and North Korea, and Vietnam today. It was widely used by East Asian literati to facilitate cross-border communication interactively face-to-face. This lingua-cultural practice is generally known as *bítán* 筆談, literally 'brushtalk' or 'brush conversation'. While brushtalk as a substitute for speech to conduct 'silent conversation' has been reported since the Sui dynasty (581–619), in this paper brushtalk data will be drawn from sources involving transcultural, cross-border communication from late Ming dynasty (1368–1644) until the 1900s. Brushtalk occurred in four recurrent contexts, comprising both interactional and transactional communication: official brushtalk (公務筆談), poetic brushtalk (詩文筆談), travelogue brushtalk (遊歷筆談), and drifting brushtalk (漂流筆談). For want of space, we will exemplify brushtalk using selected examples drawn from the first three contexts. The use of Sinitic as a 'scripta franca' seems to be *sui generis* and under-researched linguistically and sociolinguistically. More research is needed to unveil the script-specific characteristics of Sinitic in cross-border communication.

以筆談作緘默交談——漢字於近世東亞作為交際文字之運用

摘要

漢字往昔於東亞文化圈起交際文字之作用，東亞文人恆以之作面對面的跨國界互動交流，中國、朝鮮、日本及越南皆如是。這既是語言習慣，亦是文化習慣，一般稱之為「筆談」。以筆談替代口語作緘默交談之記錄，已早見於隋代，而本文之筆談則取材自明清時期記載跨越文化和國界交流之語料。筆談現象可分為問訊型及互動型兩種，並反覆出現於四類語境：公務筆談、詩文筆談、遊歷筆談及漂流筆談。篇幅所限之故，此文舉例說明首三種語境下所產生之筆談。運用漢字作書面交際語似自成一格，而涉及語言學及社會語言學方面的討論亦不多。漢字於跨國界溝通用途上的文字特質，更是有待探討。

SUBJECT KEYWORDS

Sinosphere, East Asia, Classical Chinese, Scripta franca/Written lingua franca, Logographic script

關鍵詞

漢字文化圈 東亞 文言 交際文字/書面交際語 語素文字

1 Introduction

Two decades into the new millennium, cross-border communication between strangers without a shared spoken language seems increasingly unproblematic. In an industrialized world saturated with smartphones and e-gadgets mediated in multiple languages, translation in or out via a mobile app or software is barely a few clicks or swipes away, almost instantly subject to the

only constraint of access to high-speed wireless internet. With voice technology getting more and more mature at our fingertips, meaning-making in an alien tongue is almost hassle-free, while obtaining services from AI-driven talking chatbots is visibly an emerging new trend. In more traditional retail markets, shopping in East Asia for instance, foreign tourists hardly need to speak any Chinese, Japanese, Korean or Vietnamese. Inquiries about the price of items on sale, in big shopping malls as in narrow street stalls, are typically mediated by and displayed on an electronic calculator, often supplemented with some hand and/or head gestures whether or not bargaining is involved. But what happens when no such e-communication devices are available to interlocutors with no shared spoken language?

Our focus in this study is Sinosphere during the early modern period covering about three hundred years from the 1600s until the 1900s. The term East Asia usually refers to the sovereign states China, Japan, the two Koreas, and Vietnam. During this historical period, East Asian scholar-officials were literate in Chinese, a logographic or non-alphabetic writing system consisting of thousands of characters or ‘sinograms’ (F. Wang et al. 2009; W. S-Y. Wang and Tsai 2011; cf. ‘sinographs’, Whitman 2011; ‘logogram’, Handel 2019). These literati had a powerful communicative and interactional resource at their disposal, albeit in writing. As is well-known, developing literacy in Chinese is no simple feat at all, not only because sinograms are non-alphabetic, but also because lexico-grammatically Literary Sinitic (Handel 2019), or Classical Chinese (*wényán* 文言) enriched with poetic and literary elements, has its own syntax and vocabulary, which is remote from speech regardless of the vernaculars of ‘dialect’ speakers. Such a state of diglossia explains why for centuries, developing literacy in literary Chinese was no easy task. For East Asians whose native language is typologically unrelated to Chinese, the learning curve is understandably even more steep (Mizumura 2015).

Thanks to that shared lingua-cultural heritage in literary Chinese, East Asian nationals were broadly regarded as members of the same cultural sphere despite tremendous differences in their respective languages and obvious communication barriers in speech. That cultural sphere goes by different names, notably *Hànzì Wénhuà Quān* 漢字文化圈 (Sinographic Cultural Sphere, or Sinosphere in short; cf. Sinographosphere, Handel 2019), *Dōngyà Wénhuà Quān* 東亞文化圈 (East Asian Cultural Sphere, Table 1).¹

Table 1. The terms ‘Sinographic Cultural Sphere’ and ‘East Asian Cultural Sphere’ expressed in East Asian languages. Cantonese, a Chinese topolect or ‘dialect’ which is widely spoken in the province of Guangdong and the two Special Administrative Regions Hong Kong and Macao, is included here for comparison.

	Sinosphere /Sinographic Cultural Sphere	East Asian Cultural Sphere
Mandarin Chinese	<i>hànzì wénhuà quān</i> 漢字文化圈 / 汉字文化圈	<i>dōngyà wénhuà quān</i> 東亞文化圈 / 东亚文化圈
Japanese	かんじぶんかけん <i>kanji bunka ken</i> 漢字文化圈	ひがしアジアぶんかけん <i>higashi ajia bunka ken</i> 東アジア文化圈
Korean	한자문화권 <i>hanca munhwakwen</i> 漢字文化圈	동아시아문화권 <i>tongasia munhwakwen</i> 東아시아文化圈
Vietnamese	<i>vùng văn hóa chữ Hán</i> 漢文化符漢	<i>vùng văn hóa Đông Á</i> 漢文化東亞
Cantonese*	<i>hon³³ zī²² man²¹ faa³³ hyun⁵⁵</i> 漢字文化圈	<i>dong⁵⁵ aa³³ man²¹ faa³³ hyun⁵⁵</i> 東亞文化圈

2 Sinitic brushtalk as a lingua-cultural tradition in Sinographic East Asia

For an instructive example how Sinitic brushtalk enabled literati of Chinese in early modern East Asia to make meaning seamlessly, consider the trilateral deep, silent ‘conversation’ that took place during the tumultuous years of Vietnamese resistance

¹ Also *Rújiā wénhuà quān* 儒家文化圈, ‘Confucian Cultural Sphere’.

against French colonial rule, an era that was characterized by political intrigue, anti-colonial struggles and revolution. In two monographs, *Vietnamese Anticolonialism 1885–1925* (Marr 1971) and *Colonialism and Language Policy in Viet Nam* (DeFrancis 1977), the historical background of several brush conversations between a Vietnamese anticolonial leader Phan Bội Châu 潘佩珠 (1867–1940), his Chinese contacts – reformist Liang Qichao 梁啟超 (1873–1929) and revolutionary leader Sun Yat-sen 孫逸仙 (better known in Chinese as 孫中山, 1866–1925), and Japanese leaders in 1905–1906 is covered in considerable detail (see also Phan 1999a[n.d.]):

Here [in Japan] Phan Boi Chau sought out Liang Qichao, a refugee from the wrath of the Emperor Dowager, and has several extended discussions with him. Their common language was Chinese, but in written form, for while Phan Boi Chau was able to read and write Chinese his Sino-Vietnamese pronunciation was unintelligible to his interlocutor. They sat together at a table and passed back and forth to each other sheets covered with Chinese characters written with a brush. (DeFrancis 1977:161; cf. Phan 1999b[n.d.]:255)

During his visit to Japan early in 1906 Phan Boi Chau made contact with Sun Yat-sen, a political rival of Liang Qichao who sought not reform but revolution for China, and engaged in a ‘brush conversation’ with him. Sun tried unsuccessfully to win Phan Boi Chau over to an anti-monarchical point of view (...), but the two parted on generally good terms and continued to maintain contact with each other. (DeFrancis 1977:161–162; cf. Phan 1999b[n.d.]:260)

Subsequently, through Liang Qichao, Phan Bội Châu was able to meet with a few Japanese leaders who he hoped would be willing to support the Vietnamese anticolonial struggles. In one of those meetings, three speakers with no shared spoken language were involved: Vietnamese-dominant Phan Bội Châu, Cantonese-accented Mandarin speaker Liang Qichao, and Viscount Inukai Tsuyoshi 犬養毅 (1855–1932), a Japanese councilor 代議士 with little or no knowledge of Mandarin or Vietnamese. Their brush conversation appeared to be smooth and seamless:

One of Inukai’s first questions for Phan, again transmitted by means of written Chinese, was whether his request for assistance [to fight the French colonizers] had the support of members of the Vietnamese royal family. Phan quickly pulled [King] Cuong De’s photograph and identification papers out of his pocket, whereupon Inukai suggested that Cuong De be brought out of the country. (Marr 1971:112; cf. Phan 1999b[n.d.]:255; Nguyễn and Lương 2017:179–180)

Marr’s description here is based on Phan’s recollection in his autobiography (Phan 1999a[n.d.], 1999b[n.d.], written in Classical Chinese) published some three decades later in the 1930s, which also included a few light-hearted moments in his encounters with the Japanese leaders, for example, when Phan was requested to inscribe Chinese poetic verses on a paper fan:

Inukai’s wife entered the room, bearing a fan for Phan to inscribe. He recalls brushing a line from the *Book of History*: ‘*Tu phuong phong dong duy nai chi huu*’ (The people everywhere responding as if moved by the wind – this is your excellence), an apparent appeal to the Japanese sense of duty toward their racial and cultural brothers. (Marr 1971:113; cf. Phan 1999b[n.d.]:256)²

In an earlier encounter with another Japanese leader Kashiwabara Buntarou 柏原文太郎 (1869–1936), Phan recalled him “picking up the many sheets of ‘brush conversation’ (*bút đàm*) and remarking that it was all like reading an old warrior novel” (Marr 1971:113). In all of these quotations from Marr (1971) and DeFrancis (1977), although no mention is made of what exactly transpired in the brush talk of the ‘conversationalists’ (except the inscription on a Japanese fan), there is strong evidence that the brush talkers were able to express various *speech acts* from greeting to farewell bidding, with all the attending interactional complexities in between.

² The poetic verse cited here was taken from 尚書·虞書·大禹謨 *Book II: The Counsels of the Great Yü, Part II: The Books of Yü, Shu King, Book of History*, translated by James Legge (in Waltham 1971:19). Original text in Chinese: 四方風動，惟乃之休 (pīnyīn: *Sì fāng fēng dòng, wéi nǎi zhī xiū*).

The historical examples cited above epitomize one lingua-cultural practice widely attested in social interaction between literati of Chinese in early modern East Asia: when speech failed to get their meanings across due to a lack of a shared vernacular, they would resort to brushtalk (筆談, *bǐtán*) using brush, ink, and paper. In traditional Chinese literature, the term *bǐtán* 筆談 refers to a broad range of literary genres. It is also commonly found in a few monographs, of which the earliest, *Mèngxī bǐtán* 夢溪筆談 by Shen Kuo 沈括, can be traced back to the Song dynasty (960–1279). Based on a variety of definitions each illustrated with examples as presented in various authoritative Chinese dictionaries, Y. Wang and Xie (2015:3–11) distinguish between eight more or less discrete usages of the term *bǐtán*, of which all but the last involve Chinese-Chinese interaction:

- (i) a creative genre expressing personal thoughts or reflections on miscellaneous topics;
- (ii) the use of 筆談 as the title of a short-lived Hong Kong-based magazine in 1941, featuring spontaneous thoughts, creative writing, opinions on social issues, and literary criticism;
- (iii) a synonym of the literary genre of epistolary writing;
- (iv) a brush-and-ink meaning-making practice preferred to speech out of a concern for possible information leakage to eavesdroppers, from everyday conversational contexts to life-and-death circumstances involving political intrigue or espionage;
- (iv) the only means of communication when one or more interlocutors (e.g., bed-ridden patients) are unable to speak due to sickness;
- (v) a vernacular-driven writing style championed by northern Mandarin speaker Zhou Zuoren 周作人 during the 1920s;
- (vi) a mode of communication between Chinese ‘dialect’ speakers whose vernaculars are mutually unintelligible; and
- (viii) a mode of cross-border, intercultural communication involving speakers from different countries with no shared spoken language.

In the rest of the paper, we will exemplify the last-mentioned type of interaction through 筆談 (Mand. *bǐtán*, Cant. *bat*⁵⁵ *taam*²¹, Jap. *hitsudan* ひつだん, Kor. *pildam* 필담, Viet. *bút đàm*). Our data is drawn from published sources, as documented in the vast literature published in the respective national languages. In each of the East Asian nations, there is a growing body of literature on Sinitic brushtalk. Our goal is to illustrate how brushtalk functions in three recurrent contexts, each involving particular types of participants and social roles, before drawing implications regarding the use of Sinitic as a ‘scripta franca’ (Denecke 2014a) that was so characteristic of transcultural, cross-border communication in early modern East Asia.

3 Research on brushtalk: A brief review of the literature

In terms of research interest and outputs, brushtalk as a mode of cross-border communication in early modern East Asia is by no means *terra incognita* in the respective national languages: Chinese, Japanese, Korean and (less so) Vietnamese. There is no shortage of primary data in the form of artifacts arising from deep brushtalk between ‘conversationalists’ who were educated in (especially Classical) Chinese as an integral part of their education or scholarly training. One prominent example is a three-volume collection of travelogue *Fúsāng Yóuji* 扶桑遊記 (‘Travelogue in Japan’) written by an erudite Chinese scholar Wang Tao 王韜 (1845 [1880]). Being produced when engaged in brushtalk with Japanese friends in 1879, the collection amounted to 40,000 sinograms and was published in Japan during his four-month visit there (see X. Wang and Ooba 1996:306; Howland 1996:111–112 analyzes one of Wang Tao’s poems thematizing sakura or cherry blossoms). Plenty of primary sources consisting of historical archives and special collections are housed in national or university libraries in Japan (e.g., National Diet, Waseda University) and South Korea (e.g., Yonsei University). One interesting example concerns Lord Ōkōchi Teruna 大河内輝声 (1848–1882) of Meiji Japan, an obsessed collector of brushtalk data arising from his poetic exchanges in literary Chinese with guests from Qing China. Ōkōchi was reportedly “convinced of the historical significance of his ‘society’ [and] would collect all the sheets of paper, rescuing some from the trash, press them, and then mount them on a sturdier backing to be bound into book form” (Howland 1996:44). Recently, brushtalk as a research topic is receiving increasing attention in the form of monographs

featuring historiographic compilations with annotations and commentaries in specialized volumes (e.g., in Chi.: Yuzhen Liu 2010; B. Wang 2016; in Jap.: Tanaka and Matsuura 1986; in Kor.: Hur 2013).³

By contrast, in English there is a dearth of research on Sinitic brushtalk in early modern East Asia (but see Clements 2018; Denecke 2014a, 2014b; Howland 1996; Keaveney 2009; Kornicki 2018; Tao 2005). In his monograph entitled *Beyond Brushtalk*, Keaveney (2009:2–9) offers a brief historical overview of brushtalk as a deep-rooted lingua-cultural practice in East Asia. Tao (2005) examines the crucial role of brushtalk in early Japanese-U.S. diplomacy in the mid-1850s. In the negotiations between Tokugawa Japan and the United States during Commodore Matthew C. Perry’s visits to the Bay of Edo (today’s Tokyo Bay) in 1853 and 1854, Tao (2005:93) offers an informative account why, rather than English and Japanese as often assumed, bilateral communication in US-Japanese negotiations took place principally in Dutch for oral communication, and Sinitic for documentation. Drawing on brushtalk data produced by Chinese scholars and diplomats when interacting with their Japanese friends during the 1870s–1880s, Howland (1996) shows how brushtalk in Sinitic, including the exchange of poetic verses, enabled Chinese and Japanese scholars to display the lingua-cultural nexus of their civilizations while projecting their distinctive identities. Clements (2018) and Denecke (2014a) both focus on the functions of brushtalk but from different angles. Based on official records, personal diaries and illustrations of brushtalk encounters between missions sent by the Chosŏn court to the Tokugawa shogunate from the 17th to 19th centuries, Clements (2018) discusses the communicative, artistic and performative aspects of Sinitic brushtalk in Japanese-Korean diplomacy. She argues that, as a shared ritual-like but not quite ceremonial sociocultural practice in international diplomacy, brushtalk was typically exploited by the literati of Classical Chinese to subtly showcase their civilized learning or even assert their superiority vis-à-vis their adversaries from across the Sea of Japan. By contrast, as a communicative function, conveying factual information sometimes came only second place relative to the higher-order function of making or displaying identity claims. The performative, artistic aspects of brushtalk, including calligraphic art, make Clements query the appropriateness of characterizing Sinitic brushtalk as a lingua franca. This term originally referred to the “pidgin spoken among traders along the South-Eastern coast of the Mediterranean between the fifteenth to nineteenth centuries” (p. 21). As such, calling Sinitic brushtalk a (written) lingua franca would be problematic on two counts: it was neither a pidgin nor a spoken language. Instead, Clements (2018) considers Denecke’s (2014a) term ‘scripta franca’ a better fit (cf. ‘written linguistic code’, Howland 1996:45):

The greatest advantage of the Chinese script (...) is that it enabled literate people in early modern East Asia to communicate directly in the absence of a common spoken language. Chinese-style writing was the East Asian lingua franca, or we should rather say scripta franca, because unlike elites who wrote *and* conversed in Latin in medieval and early modern Europe, Chinese-style writing was written language, a grapholect. (Denecke 2014a:209, emphasis in original)

Rather than a deficient writing system, Denecke (2014a) critiques the alleged superiority of alphabetic scripts and points to one neglected, productive aspect of the logographic Chinese script in intercultural communication: for over a thousand years, East Asian politics may be likened to “worlds without translation”, for learning and reading Classical Chinese by gloss (*kundoku* in Japanese) allowed for cross-border communication among East Asian literati with relative ease (cf. Lurie 2011). For obvious reasons, brushtalk as a historically rich and shared lingua-cultural practice is much more actively researched and published in each of the East Asian languages. Owing to space limitations, we will draw attention to only a few works where extensive brushtalk data is compiled or annotated with commentaries.

Chinese: B. Wang (2016) is an eight-volume compilation of selected manuscripts of Sinitic brushtalk collected by Ōkōchi and reproduced in high-resolution colorful images. A collection of conference papers edited by Y. Wang and Xie (2015) covers Chinese-Japanese and Chinese-Korean brushtalk produced by the literati, gentry and diplomats, but also by Japanese monks and seafarers in different epochs. The genres varied, from more conversation-like to more poetic. Yuzhen Liu (2010) documents

³ Monographs on Sinitic brushtalk written in modern Vietnamese are rare.

brush-talk data collected from Qing diplomats while discharging their duties as Chinese ambassadors or embassy personnel in Meiji Japan. Y. Wang (2013) adduces the sociocultural significance of brush-talk as shown in the travelogues written by Korean and Vietnamese envoys.

Japanese: Extensive formal, deep conversational interactions between Japanese and Korean literati during official diplomatic and trade missions are reported, for example, Chosŏn missions to Japan (W.-s. Lee 1997; Ogawa 2012; Moon 2018), and Japanese missions to China, especially the official visit on board the *Senzaimaru* 千歳丸 to Shanghai in 1862 (Feng 1999; Yokoyama 2002; Fujita 2015, 2016). According to Feng (1999), it was ‘deep brush conversation’ that enabled Takasugi Shinsaku 高杉晋作 (1839–1867), a Japanese samurai politician, and Chen Ruqin 陳汝欽, a Chinese Confucian scholar, to develop intellectual communion and lasting friendship after exchanging personal views via Sinitic brush-talk on Chinese philosophy and various sociopolitical issues of shared interest.

Korean: Hur (2013) is a collection of 178 monographs of poetic exchanges and brush conversations between Korean envoys and Japanese officials for over 200 years from 1607 to 1811, with translation into Korean *Philtamchanghwacip* 筆談唱和集. A subset of this collection was later used by Koo (2011) to analyze how knowledge of literature and art was spread from the Korean envoys to the Japanese in the 17th century, and another subset by Hur and Cho (‘Record of written conversations and poetry’, 2016) to examine the diplomatic relations between Japan and Korea during that period. Chang (2017) discusses the significance of the brush conversations between Japanese officials and Korean envoys sent to Japan in 1764. H.-s. Lee (1996) investigates the brush conversations between Korean and Japanese scholars on neo-Confucianism in 1711. Kim et al. (2015) examine the exchange on medical knowledge between Korean and Japanese medics through brush-talk.

Vietnamese: Lý (2007, 2009), Trịnh and Đ. T. Nguyễn (2012a, 2012b) investigate the poetic exchange between envoys from Vietnam and Korea in the celestial capital Peking. M. T. Nguyễn (2009) and T. T. Nguyễn (2012) examine the diplomatic interchange between the ambassadors from Vietnam and Korea in China during the 18th century. There are also Chinese studies focusing on Sino-Vietnamese interaction. Yu and Liang (2013) exemplify brush-talk between Chinese and Vietnamese officials, which reflect the history of international relations between the two countries. J. Zhang (2012) outlines the six brush conversations produced by Vietnamese envoy Lê Quý Đôn 黎貴惇 (1726–1784), a famous scholar-official dispatched by the late Lê dynasty to China in 1761. Yujun Liu (2007:293–367) discusses the significance of ‘poetic diplomacy’ between Vietnam and China, and observes that poetic exchanges between diplomatic missions through Sinitic brush-talk were very common between the 16th and 19th centuries.

4 Silent conversation through brush-talk: Some examples

The contexts of brush-talk vary, from conducting official business (e.g. between courtiers and foreign diplomats) to enjoying artistic appreciation of poetry and/or other art forms (e.g., between friends) to a more question-and-answer type of communication between foreign travelers and local people. In terms of the genre of writing, the deep, intellectual exchange between literati would usually stick to literary Chinese, sometimes mixed with vernacular-based colloquial elements characteristic of the region. To exemplify brush-talk in face-to-face interaction, we will present selected examples excerpted from the literature. Unlike in treatises on Sinitic brush-talk published in English, where excerpts are presented in English translation only (see, e.g., Howland 1996:48–49, 58–59, 63), we will cite original brush-talk data in Chinese, followed by an idiomatic English translation. The examples will be structured according to three recurrent contexts, each involving typical participants:

- (i) Travelogue brush-talk (遊歷筆談): foreign visitors buying things from local people or asking for concrete information or service
- (ii) Official brush-talk (公務筆談): scholar-officials discussing formal business with diplomats while receiving foreign missions

- (iii) Poetic brushtalk (詩文筆談): scholar-officials and diplomats engaged in exchange of poetic verses or artistic improvisation ostensibly for displaying or appreciating civilized learning, sometimes embedded with subtle identity negotiations and claims

In English publications, interactional communication contexts characteristic of (ii) and (iii) are most frequently cited (e.g., Clements 2015, 2018; Denecke 2014a; Howland 1996; Keaveney 2009), with little mention of contexts involving transactional communication as in (i), despite frequent mention of Sinitic brushtalk in travelogues produced by East Asian travelers during their cross-border visits. In all of the examples of ‘silent conversation’ below, it should be noted that the brushtalkers in question either do not have a shared spoken language at their disposal, or that they find brushtalking a preferred and more productive alternative to speech as it allows them to express themselves more clearly, thoroughly and effectively.

4.1 Communication between foreign travellers and local people (travelogue brushtalk 遊歷筆談)

In example (1), a Japanese student of Chinese medicine (Okada Kousho, 岡田篁所 [1821–1903]) and a Chinese doctor of Confucian medical tradition (Tong Kunyu, 童昆玉) were engaged in brushtalk in Shanghai (punctuation marks added by editors of publications cited). It took place during Okada’s visit to Shanghai. Eager to learn about the latest advancements in the field, he asked Tong, a new acquaintance, about the names of leading Chinese doctors and practitioners in the Confucian medical tradition.

(1) *Japanese-Chinese* (1872)

岡田 (Okada):	上海現今儒醫，其高名者為誰。	‘What are the esteemed names of well-known practitioners of the Confucian medical tradition in Shanghai?’
童 (Tong):	高者赴京求官，留上海者，未知其高手為誰。恐無其人矣。	‘The distinguished ones left for Beijing to serve at the court; of those who stay in Shanghai, not sure who the esteemed ones are. [I am] afraid there are none.’
岡田 (Okada):	現今天下高名儒醫，其著述新刊，請教。	‘On the esteemed practitioners of the Confucian medical tradition in China and their recent published works, please advise.’
童 (Tong):	醫則蘇州葉天士，儒則劉墉官至宰相。	‘There is medical doctor Ye Tianshi of Suzhou, but also Confucian scholar Liu Yong, [the latter] rose to become Prime Minister.’

(Excerpted from *Ko Go Nikki* 滬吳日記 ‘Diary of Shanghai and Jiangsu’, in Okada 1891:5a–b; also cited in Liang and Mayanagi 2005)

In 1721, Yu Thak-Ki 俞拓基, a Chosŏn scholar (1691–1767), went to Peking and asked two Chinese students Peng Tan 彭坦 and Peng Cheng 彭城, who were going to sit for the civil service examination (科舉 *kējǔ*), to what extent Han culture was inherited from the Ming dynasty under the Manchu. This topic was frequently raised by Chosŏn literati during their missions to Qing China out of a concern for the ‘purity’ of Han Chinese culture during the reign of Manchu ‘barbarians’.

(2) *Korean-Chinese* (1721)

俞 (Yu):	明朝制度尚有流傳者否?	‘Are there any inherited Ming institutions now?’
彭 (Peng):	大同小異。	‘Mostly the same.’
俞 (Yu):	所謂大同小異者，指冠服而言耶?	‘“Mostly the same” refers to clothes?’
彭 (Peng):	不過車服禮器。	‘Only carriages, clothes, and ritual vessels.’

(T.-K. Yu 2001 [1721]:121; also cited in S. He 2010; it is unclear which of the Peng’s responded)

4.2 Formal business communication between scholar-officials and diplomats (official brushtalk 公務筆談)

Before the Sino-French War broke out (August 1884 to April 1885), the Qing court and the Vietnamese Nguyễn court frequently sent envoys to each other to discuss how to deal with the colonizer France. For instance, in May 1882, the Nguyễn

court sent Nguyễn Tịch 阮籍, a member of the Hànlin Academy, to Guangdong province to discuss critical issues with Tang Tinggeng 唐廷庚 (1835–1896), a Merchants Bureau official. For security’s sake, they conducted brushtalk in a secret chamber (Example (3)):

(3) *Chinese-Vietnamese* (1882)

唐 (Tang):	順安本局來信，謂貴官另有要件面商，不知是否。	‘[I] received a letter from the main office of Thuận An, saying that your Esteemed Self have another important matter to discuss face-to-face. Is that true?’
阮 (Nguyễn):	(…) 河內省、海防兩處已為法人所佔 (…) 求貴大人代稟李伯相及兩廣督憲，務必憐恤藩封，設法拯救。	‘Hà Nội and Hải Phòng were occupied by the French already! (...) I beg your honor to help pass this message to Li Boxiang and the Governor of Kwangtung and Kwanghsi. Do have pity on [your] good-neighborly tributary and try to rescue [us]!’
唐 (Tang):	貴官有貴國公文帶來否。	‘Do your Esteemed Self have any official document from your Esteemed country?’
阮 (Nguyễn):	此等密事，不敢用筆墨，故陳侍郎託貴局周大人函知，俾晚生面陳。	‘These issues being highly confidential, [we] dared not write [them] down on paper. So Secretary Trần entreated Mr Zhou of your Esteemed Office to inform [you, and] to let me brief [you] in person.’

(Excerpted from “署兩廣總督裕寬向總署抄送唐廷庚與越陪臣問答節畧”，in Z. Zhang 1996:155-156, also cited in X. Yu and Liang 2013)

Example (4) features a brush conversation between a Chosŏn official Choy Seng-Tay 崔成大 and a Japanese sinologist Mishima Chuushou 三島中洲 (1831–1919) conducted in Tokyo. As a member of the Chosŏn delegation to Japan, Choy visited Mishima to discuss Japan’s modernization process. As it was hot and humid, the climate of leading Japanese cities was chosen as their ‘conversation opener’, followed by Choy’s mention of his toothache and Mishima’s invitation for Choy to make himself more comfortable by removing his hat.

(4) *Korean-Japanese* (1881)

三島 (Mishima):	弊 ⁴ 邦氣候最好處，為西京及大坂，如東京則稍寒，易生疾，真如貴喻。	‘In our modest country, the best climate [is found in] Kyoto and Osaka. Tokyo is a little too cold, [and so people] easily get sick, indeed as you mentioned.’
崔 (Choe):	此亦受濕所崇耶。近以齒痛為苦。酒後愈甚。	‘It could also be due to humidity. Recently [I] suffer from toothache, [it gets] worse after drinking.’
三島 (Mishima):	今日驟暑。請先生脫冠縱談。	‘Today gets very hot. Please, Master [may want to] remove [your] hat [so as] to talk more unrestrainedly.’

(Excerpted from “三島中洲・川北梅山・崔成大 筆談錄”，in Nishogakusha University Committee 2015:77)

4.3 Officials/diplomats/scholars engaged in Poetic exchange or Artistic improvisation (poetic brushtalk 詩文筆談)

By far the most often cited genre of cross-border communication via brushtalk in the literature, published in East Asian languages or English, is scholarly exchange of poetic verses or artistic improvisation of visual aspects of Chinese writing, including but not limited to calligraphy. As is different from prose, poetic verses tended to follow traditional metrics in Chinese poetry writing. Two of the high-frequency formats are penta-syllabic quatrain (五言絕句, verses made up of four 5-syllable lines) and hepta-syllabic octave (七言律詩, verses made up of eight 7-syllable lines), with rhyme falling on alternate lines. One

⁴ It was already common for Japanese to replace 敝 with 弊 in this period. See Nishogakusha University Committee (2015:20) for more details.

illustration each is exemplified below. Example (5) is a penta-syllabic quatrain written by Chen Rongchang 陳榮昌 (1860–1935), a Chinese scholar who researched the education system, culture and politics in Meiji Japan from 1905.

(5) *Chinese-Japanese* (1905)

蘭為王者香	‘Orchids exude royal fragrance,
何事在空谷	what are they doing in an empty valley?
佳友結靈芝	In the company of good friend <i>lingzhi</i> [靈芝] ⁵
千秋播芬鬱	their aroma transcends a thousand years.’

(Cited in Chen 2013; our English translation)

The poem was written for a painting produced by Tadachika Takada 高田忠周 (1863–1949), a Sinologist specializing in paleography, during a meal arranged by a mutual friend Tokunou Michimasa 得能通昌 (1852–1913). As indicated in Chen’s intimate diary (*Yisi Dōngyóu Riji* 乙巳東遊日記), he did not speak any Japanese, and so communication with his Japanese hosts and friends was carried out entirely through brushtalk.

The following hepta-syllabic octave, entitled *Đáp Triều Tiên quốc sứ Lý Tuý Quang* 答朝鮮國使李晔光 (‘Response to Chosŏn Ambassador Li Swu-Kwang’), was produced by a Vietnamese diplomat Phùng Khắc Khoan 馮克寬 (1528–1613) in response to two poems – also hepta-syllabic octaves – composed by Li as part of their semi-official, semi-social encounters during the late Ming dynasty in Peking.

(6) *Vietnamese-Korean* (1597)

義安何地不安居 禮接誠交樂有餘
彼此雖殊山海域 淵源同一聖賢書
交鄰便是信為本 進德深惟敬作輿
記取使詔還國日 東南五色望雲車

‘With righteousness in place, any land can become a peaceful habitat. With rites and sincerity in hearts and minds, people will enjoy abundant happiness. Despite drastic difference in our lands and seas, [our] shared origin is rooted in the same Sages’ literary works. Trust is the foundation of good-neighborly relations, reverence is key to attaining virtue. Ambassador’s repatriation day is on [my] mind, may Providence let peace prevail by bestowing five colors [to Chosŏn] in the Southeast’.⁶

(Poem excerpted from “安南國使臣唱和問答錄”,
in Li 2001 [1597]:129, also cited in Yujun Liu 2007:366)

Compared with their verbal interaction in speech, the exchange of poetic verses and artistic improvisation between the two diplomats through brushtalk was prolific and, for that reason, well documented.

5 Discussion: Sinitic as a scripta franca in Early Modern East Asia

Sinograms, or written Chinese characters, have been in use uninterruptedly for over 3,000 years. Being orthographically logographic and non-alphabetical, their written forms give minimal clues to their pronunciation and are characterized by scanty use of inflectional morphology. Historically, Chinese texts – from Classical Chinese canons and literary works to primers for learning Chinese characters and practical readers with illustrations of herbal medicine – were collectively looked upon by people in East Asia as words of wisdom that hold the key to secrets of a fine life and superior sociocultural practices. Until the early modern period, for learners and users of written Chinese in sinographic East Asia, the key to all this was willingness and readiness to ‘crack the code’ through hard work, provided they had the means and determination to do so.

⁵ In China, *lingzhi* is a fungus with high nutritious or even medical value.

⁶ Our translation, incorporated with interpretation by Han Xiaorong 韓孝榮 and Mok Wan-Hon 莫雲漢. Their kind assistance is hereby gratefully acknowledged.

As a correlate of the governments' use of Sinitic as the language of governance and a repository for all-purpose formal record keeping, many East Asian literati were able to prove their worth and flair in literary Chinese in their encounters with imperial Chinese officials. One frequently cited scenario since the Sui (581–618) and Tang Dynasty (618–907) is exchange of poems, improvised creatively or recalled from memory, when delegates of tributary states (Old Chosŏn, today's Korea; the Ryūkyūs, today's Okinawa; or Annam, today's Vietnam) met with courtiers or scholar-officials of the empire in the celestial capital. One such diplomatic encounter was reported by Best (1982:444-449), when delegates of the tributary from the ancient Korean kingdom Paekche 百濟 met with their Chinese hosts in the Six Dynasties period (220–589). Nor was this practice confined to imperial China. According to Borgen (1994:230), between 728 and 929, the Japanese court received delegates from a distant polity like Parhae 渤海 on 33 missions. On one of these missions, such a ritual-like practice was reportedly adopted:

The welcoming of the visitors from Parhae began with an exchange of Chinese poems between Sugawara no Michizane and the other Japanese hosts and the dignitaries from Parhae. Only when Chinese poetry had been exchanged could formal negotiations begin. Depending on the availability of interpreters, it can easily be imagined that both parties might be compelled to depend on the writing brush as the sole means of conducting negotiations. (Keaveney 2009:7)

During the Tokugawa period (1603–1868), a similar traditional practice of exchanging Chinese poetry was followed by the shogunate officials when receiving envoys from the Yi (Chosŏn) Court in Korea (Keaveney 2009:8). Examples such as these indicate clearly that intercultural exchange among East Asian intellectuals was carried out in brushtalk, “a phenomenon that has its origins in the earliest exchanges among literate individuals in the Sinitic world” (Keaveney 2009:2–3).

For neighboring polities at the four corners of the Middle Kingdom as far-flung as the Ryūkyū Islands, securing the status of a tributary vassal state was a convenient way to gain recognition as a civilized nation as evidenced in their flair in literary Chinese, but also – given the asymmetric power relations – to neutralize or minimize any threat of being attacked by the hegemon (Ge 2018). How important and necessary such cross-border communication was with tributary states may be gauged by the decision of Tang Emperor Taizong (598–649) to set up a Confucian academy *Chóngwénguǎn* 崇文館 to teach literary Chinese to foreign students systematically (Keaveney 2009:4). Another imperial Chinese institution introduced since the Sui dynasty, namely the selection of officials through civil service examinations on Classical Chinese canons, was adopted by Old Korea and Old Vietnam (Elman 2014).

Even though Chinese-style civil examinations were only briefly introduced in Japan during the Heian period (Mizumura 2015:114; cf. Kornicki 2018:259) and the late Tokugawa or Edo period (Tao 2005:105), administration-related practical needs resulted in widespread popular literacy in literary Chinese from then on (Lurie 2011; Rubinger 2007). By 1850, the literacy rate in Japan “seems to have been as high as that in many parts of Europe, perhaps higher than some” (Beasley 1987:27). Being highly valued, such a millennium-old tradition of cultivating literacy in literary Chinese may be traced back to the Nara (710–794) and Heian (794–1185) periods when, upon completing their mission paying tribute to the Middle Kingdom, homeward-bound Japanese delegates would invite outstanding Chinese scholars to teach Chinese in Japan (X. Wang and Ooba 1996:107). No wonder most Heian courtiers were able to read and write *kanbun* (Chinese text) and compose *kanshi* (Chinese poetry), both being regarded as indispensable skills when interacting with their Chinese counterparts. Such fine literacy practices have evidently withstood the test of time. During the Meiji period (1868–1912), several *kangakusha* (漢學者, Sinology scholars) shot to fame with their unrivaled mastery of literary Chinese. To them, brushtalk “provided the immediate means of exchange and cross cultural and literary exchange” and so it “remained an apposite and effective means of communication with Chinese hosts” (Keaveney 2009:9).

The spontaneity and fecundity of Sinitic brushtalk between the literati of sinographic East Asia may be explained, on one hand, by their lack of a shared spoken language and, on the other hand, their determination to communicate and make meaning thanks to their shared knowledge of written (especially Classical) Chinese. Literary Chinese, which is lexico-grammatically characterized by scanty inflectional morphology and orthographically by more or less stable and mutually intelligible meanings (i.e. logographic sinograms), allowed literati from different East Asian polities to express themselves in *their* own language

without knowing or having to ask ‘how do you say it in your language?’. This is how literary Chinese could serve as a workable or even preferred substitute, albeit in writing using brush, ink and paper. Importantly, in the voluminous literature on brushtalk, while there is occasional mention of miscommunication or misunderstanding (see, e.g., Okada 1891:5a), awe-inspiring admiration, often mixed with a sentiment of disbelief in reaction to what was improvised by fellow brushtalkers, is more commonly documented. Such a reaction is especially common when what transpired on paper carries aesthetic value and belletristic elegance expressed in a poetic genre as exemplified above.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we have provided evidence of Sinitic brushtalk as a historically active mode of cross-border intercultural communication in sinographic East Asia or Sinosphere in three recurrent contexts: (i) travelogue brushtalk (遊歷筆談); (ii) official brushtalk (公務筆談); and (iii) poetic brushtalk (詩文筆談). Being a pan-Sinosphere lingua-cultural practice among literati in early modern East Asia when engaged in cross-border communication, brushtalk has yielded a fairly large amount of primary data in Old Japan, Old Korea and Old Vietnam, part of which has been compiled and reported (see, e.g., B. Zhang 2017, 2018; and *Yùwài Hànjí Yánjiū Cóngshū* 域外漢籍研究叢書 ‘Research on Asian Classics in Chinese’ book series edited by B. Zhang). There is *prima facie* (absence of) evidence that the use of Sinitic brushtalk as a *scripta franca* is a *sui generis* language contact phenomenon. More fine-grained research is needed to ascertain this point, however.

Performing ‘silent conversation’ by writing down what one wants to say interactively face-to-face, as a substitute for speech so to speak, is historically a widely attested modality of communication among literati in sinographic East Asia. Such a modality adds to our knowledge of existing modalities to date: speech and (tactile) sign language (Li, Aoyama, and Wong, forthcoming). Until the early modern era, being literate in East Asia means essentially being able to read and write Chinese. In cross-border communication involving interlocutors from different language backgrounds, in terms of communicative effectiveness, accurate pronunciation of several thousand sinograms matters far less compared with one’s ability to select – and compose, sometimes in splendid calligraphy – appropriate sinograms to evoke the intended meanings rooted in the nexus of fine semantic nuances and associations. This was often achieved by juxtaposing sinograms imbued with multiple layers of intertextuality by virtue of their refined use embedded in elegantly composed poetry or fine prose in the distant past. To this day, the time-honored tradition of meaning-making through composing sinograms continues to be relevant and observable, except that brush and ink have yielded to more convenient and handy writing instruments in keeping with technological advancement (e.g., Wang Guohua 王國華 recalls brushtalking with the late centenarian Sinologist, Jao Tsung-I 饒宗頤 in their intellectual exchanges, see G. Wang 2015:50).

Sinitic brushtalk, historically attested for hundreds of years until 1900s, has received considerable attention in the realms of East Asian diplomatic history, international relations, literary and cultural studies, among other neighboring disciplines within the humanities. As a linguistic and sociolinguistic phenomenon, however, the *scripta franca* function of Sinitic brushtalk is clearly under-researched. This paper has barely scratched the surface. There is clearly room for more concerted efforts by scholars of East Asian studies, historical linguists and sociolinguists with expert knowledge of Sinitic, especially Classical Chinese and literary Chinese, with a view to deepening our understanding of the script-specific characteristics of cross-border intercultural communication between our literati forefathers in sinographic East Asia.

REFERENCES

References in English:

- Beasley, William Gerald. 1987. *Japanese imperialism, 1894–1945*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Best, Jonathan W. 1982. Diplomatic and cultural contacts between Paekche and China. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 42(2): 443–501. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2718942> (accessed 28 July 2019).
- Borgen, Robert. 1994. *Sugawara no Michizane and the early Heian court*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.
- Clements, Rebekah. 2015. *A cultural history of translation in Early Modern Japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Clements, Rebekah. 2018. Brush talk as the 'lingua franca' of East Asian diplomacy in Japanese-Korean encounters (17th-19th centuries). *Historical Journal*. <http://dro.dur.ac.uk/25284/> (accessed 28 July 2019).
- DeFrancis, John. 1977. *Colonialism and language policy in Viet Nam*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Denecke, Wiebke. 2014a. Worlds without translation: Premodern East Asia and the power of character scripts. In Sandra Bermann & Catherine Porter (eds.), *A companion to translation studies*, 204–216. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell Publishing, Inc.
- Denecke, Wiebke. 2014b. *Classical world literatures: Sino-Japanese and Greco-Roman comparisons*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Elman, Benjamin A. 2014. Unintended consequences of classical literacies for the Early Modern Chinese civil examinations. In Benjamin A. Elman (ed.), *Rethinking East Asian languages, vernaculars, and literacy, 1000–1919*, 198–219. Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- Gē, Zhàoguāng 葛兆光. 2018. *What is China? Territory, ethnicity, culture, and history*, trans. Michael Gibbs Hill. Harvard: Harvard University Press.
- Handel, Zev J. 2019. *Sinography: The borrowing and adaptation of the Chinese script*. Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- Hansell, Mark. 2002. Functional answers to structural problems in thinking about writing. In Mary S. Erbaugh (ed.), *Difficult characters: Interdisciplinary studies of Chinese and Japanese writing*, 124–176. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University National East Asian Language Resource Center.
- Howland, Douglas R. 1996. *Borders of Chinese civilization: Geography and history at empire's end*. Durham & London: Duke University Press.
- Hur, Kyoung-Jin & Young-Sim Cho. 2016. Aspects of Korea-Japan cultural exchanges analyzed through tongshinsa delegations during the national seclusion period. *Athens Journal of History* 2(2). 129–136. <https://www.athensjournals.gr/history/2016-2-2-4-Hur.pdf> (accessed 28 July 2019)
- Keaveney, Christopher T. 2009. *Beyond brushtalk: Sino-Japanese literary exchange in the interwar period*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Kornicki, Peter Francis. 2018. *Languages, scripts, and Chinese texts in East Asia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Li, David C.S., Reijiro Aoyama & Tak-sum Wong. forthcoming. Silent conversation through brush, ink and paper: Sinitic brushtalk as a forgotten modality of face-to-face communication in early modern East Asia.
- Lurie, David B. 2011. *Realms of literacy: Early Japan and the history of writing*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Marr, David George. 1971. *Vietnamese anticolonialism 1885–1925*. Berkeley, Los Angeles & London: University of California Press.
- Mizumura, Minae 水村美苗. 2015. *The fall of language in the age of English*, trans. Mari Yoshihara & Juliet Winters Carpenter. New York: Columbia University Press. (Orig. Pub. 2008.)
- Phan, Bội Châu 潘佩珠. 1999a[n.d.]. *Overtaken chariot. The autobiography of PHAN-BỘI-CHÂU*. (Trans. by Vinh Sinh and Nicholas Wickenden). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Rubinger, Ribhard. 2007. *Popular literacy in early modern Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Tao, De-min 陶德民. 2005. Negotiating language in the opening of Japan: Luo Sen's journal of Perry's 1854 expedition. *Japan Review* 17. 91–119.
- Waltham, Clae. 1971. *Shu Ching: Book of History: A modernized edition of the translations of James Legge*. Washington D.C.: Henry Regnery Company.
- Wang, Feng 汪鋒, Yaching Tsai 蔡雅菁, and William Shi-Yuan Wang 王士元. 2009. Chinese literacy. In David Richard Olson & Nancy Torrance (eds.), *The Cambridge handbook on literacy*, 386–417. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wang, William Shi-Yuan 王士元, and Yaching Tsai 蔡雅菁. 2011. The alphabet and the sinogram: Setting the stage for a look across orthographies. In Peggy D. McCardle, Brett Miller, Jun Ren Lee & Ovid Jyh Lang Tzeng (eds.), *Dyslexia across languages: Orthography and the brain-gene-behavior link*, 1–16. Baltimore, MD: Brookes Publishing.

Whitman, John. 2011. The ubiquity of the gloss. *Scripta: International Journal of Writing Systems* 3. http://scripta.kr/scripta2010/en/scripta_archives/scripta_v03_a005.pdf (accessed 28 July 2019).

References in Chinese:

- Chén, Yǒukāng 陳友康. 2013. 晚清陳榮昌與日本人士的詩歌交流 [Late Qīng scholar Chén Róngchāng's exchange of poetic verses with Japanese friends]. Paper presented at 「漢文筆談與意象西湖」國際學術研討會 [The international conference on brush conversation in Classical Chinese and impression of Xīhú], Hangzhou, 14–15 September. http://dyyjy.zjgsu.edu.cn/UploadFiles/Files/2013-09/YX_20130910115752452.doc (accessed 26 November 2018).
- Liú, Yùjùn 劉玉珺. 2007. 越南漢喃古籍的文獻學研究 [A philological study of Hán nôm antique books in Vietnam]. Peking: Zhonghua Book Company.
- Liú, Yùzhēn 劉雨珍. 2010. 清代首屆駐日公使館員筆談資料彙編 [A collection of brush conversations by the staff of the first Qīng Embassy to Japan]. Tianjin: Tianjin Renmin Press.
- Nguyễn, Tuán Cường 阮俊強, and Lương, Thị Thu 梁氏秋. 2017. Dissemination of western learning in the east and the book exchange: A study of the late imperial Vietnam's revised version of the citizen reader 西學東漸與書籍交流: 近代越南《新訂國民讀本》的歐亞旅程. 中正漢學研究 [Chung Cheng Studies in Sinology] 30(2). 177-206.
- Phan, Bội Châu 潘佩珠. 1999b[n.d.]. Tự phán 自判 [Self-judgement]. In Eiichi Chishima 千島英一 & Ryouzu Sakurai 櫻井良樹 (eds.), ヴェトナム独立運動家潘佩珠伝: 日本・中国を駆け抜けた革命家の生涯 [Biography of Vietnamese independence activist Phan Bội Châu: Life of a revolutionary roaming in Japan and China], 239–318. Tōkyō: Fuyoshobo Press.
- Wáng, Bǎopíng 王寶平 (ed.). 2016. 日本藏晚清中日朝筆談資料: 大河內文書 [Late Qīng brushtalk data between Chinese, Japanese and Koreans in Japan — Ōkōchi documents]. Hangzhou: Zhejiang Ancient Books Publishing House.
- Wáng, Guóhuá 王國華. 2015. 心經簡林: 饒宗頤的書法藝術 [Wisdom Path: Jao Tsung-I's calligraphic art]. Hong Kong: Chung Hwa Book Company.
- Wáng, Xiǎoqiū 王曉秋 & Osamu Ooba 大庭脩 (eds). 1996. 中日文化交流史大系 [1]: 歷史卷 [A collection of cultural exchange between China and Japan in history [1]: History]. Hangzhou: Zhejiang People's Publishing House.
- Wáng, Tāo 王滔. 1985 [1880]. 扶桑遊記 [Travelogue in Japan]. Changsha: Yuelu Publishing House.
- Wáng, Yǒng 王勇. 2013. Review on written documents of travelers to Běijīng in Míng and Qīng Dynasties — One study of East Asian written documents 燕行使筆談文獻概述——東亞筆談文獻研究之一. *Foreign Studies* 外文研究 1.2. 37–42.
- Wáng, Yǒng 王勇 & Yǒng Xiè 謝詠 (eds.). 2015. 東亞的筆談研究 [Studies on brushtalk in East Asia]. Hangzhou: Zhejiang Gongshang University Press.
- Yú, Xiàngdōng 于向東 & Mào huá Liáng 梁茂華. 2013. A way of communication between Chinese and Vietnamese in history: Writing conversation 歷史上中越兩國人士的交流方式: 筆談. *China's Borderland History and Geography Studies* 中國邊疆史地研究 23(4). 108–116.
- Zhāng, Bówěi 張伯偉. 2017. 東亞漢文學研究的方法與實踐 [The methods and practice in research on East Asian Sinitic literature]. Peking: Zhonghua Books Co.
- Zhāng, Bówěi 張伯偉. 2018. Preface to the Korean edition of “The Methods and Practice in Research on East Asian Sinitic Literature”. *Journal of Cultural Interaction in East Asia* 9. 23–30.
- Zhāng, Jīnghuá 張京華. 2012. 三夷相會: 以越南漢文燕行文獻為中心 [Meeting of the three barbarians: Focusing on the Yānxíng literatures of Vietnam written in Chinese]. *Foreign Literature Review* 外國文學評論 2012(1). 5–44.
- Zhāng, Zhènkūn 張振鵬 (ed.). 1996. 中法戰爭 (第一冊) [Sino-French War (Volume 1)]. Peking: Zhonghua Book Company.

References in Japanese:

- Féng, Tiānyú 馮天瑜. 1999. 「千歲丸」の上海行——日本幕末期の中国觀察を評す [The "Sensaimasu" visit to Shanghai: Comments on China's observations towards the end of the tokugawa period]. 中国 [China] 21(7). 169–198. https://aichiu.repo.nii.ac.jp/?action=repository_uri&item_id=6596&file_id=22&file_no=1 (accessed 26/11/2018).

- Fujita, Yoshihisa 藤田佳久. 2015. The feature of Shanghai at 1862 documented by two Japanese 幕末期に日本人が訪れ記録した上海像—納富介次郎と日比野輝寛の日記の場合—. *Annual Reports of Open Research Center, Toa Dobun Shoin Memorial Center* 同文書院記念報 23. 91–114.
https://aichiu.repo.nii.ac.jp/?action=repository_uri&item_id=7801&file_id=22&file_no=1 (accessed 26 November 2018).
- Fujita, Yoshihisa 藤田佳久. 2016. The space of field works in Shanghai by Japanese each young samurai visiting from Japan in 1862 幕末期に上海を訪れた日本人青年藩士たちの行動空間—名倉予何人、中牟田倉之助、高杉晋作—. *Annual Reports of Open Research Center, Toa Dobun Shoin Memorial Center* 同文書院記念報 24. 143–173.
https://aichiu.repo.nii.ac.jp/?action=repository_uri&item_id=7803&file_id=22&file_no=1 (accessed 26 November 2018).
- Lee, Won-sik 李元植. 1997. 朝鮮通信使の研究 [Studies of Chosŏn envoys]. Kyōto: Shibunkaku.
- Liáng, Yǒngxuān 梁永宣 & Makoto Mayanagi 真柳誠. 2005. Okada Kousho and historical material of medical exchange between Japan and China in the last part of the Qing dynasty 岡田篁所と清末の日中医学交流史料. *Journal of the Japanese Society for the History of Medicine* 日本医史学雑誌 51(1). 25–49. <http://jsmh.umin.jp/journal/51-1/25.pdf> (accessed 26 November 2018).
- Moon, Kyungchol 文慶喆. 2018. Communication of Japan and Korea by a conversation by means of writing 筆談による日韓のコミュニケーション. *Policy Management Studies* 総合政策論集 17(1). 73–88.
- Nishogakusha University Committee 二松學舎大学大学資料展示室運営委員会. 2015. *Chushu and Modern* 三島中洲と近代. Tōkyō: Nishogakusha University.
- Okada, Kouan 岡田恒菴. 1891. 滬吳日記 [Diary of Shanghai and Jiangsu]. Kyōto: Tenrindou.
<http://dl.ndl.go.jp/info:ndljp/pid/766953> (accessed 28 July 2019).
- Ogawa, Kazuya 小川和也. 2012. 天和度朝鮮通信使と大老・堀田正俊の「筆談唱和」 ["Brushtalk and poetry exchange" between Tenwado Korean envoys and the Tairou Hotta Masatoshi]. 日韓相互認識 [Mutual Understanding between Japan and Korea] 5. 1–53. <https://hermes-ir.lib.hit-u.ac.jp/rs/handle/10086/22237> (accessed 26 November 2018).
- Tanaka, Kenji 田中謙二 & Akira Matsuura 松浦章. 1986. *Materials concerning to the Chinese ship casted away on the coast of Sizuoka Prefecture in 1826 (Bunsei 9): Materials' series of Chinese ships casted away on the coast of Japanese Islands in the Edo period No. 2* 文政九年遠州漂着得泰船資料—江戸時代漂着唐船資料集二—. Suita, Ōsaka: Kansai University Press.
- Yokoyama, Hiroaki 横山宏章. 2002. The first visit to Shanghai by the "Senzaimaru" in 1862 文久二年幕府派遣「千歳丸」随員の中国観—長崎発中国行の第1号は上海で何をみたか—. *Journal of the Faculty of Global Communication, Siebold University of Nagasaki* 県立長崎シーボルト大学国際情報学部紀要 3. 197–206.

References in Korean:

- He, Shu-yi 何淑宜. 2010. Observations on Chinese rituals and customs by Korean ambassadors in 17–18th century China 17·18世紀 朝鮮使節의 中國 禮俗 觀察. *Korean Studies* 國學研究 16. 537–574.
- Hur, Kyoung-Jin 許敬震 (ed.). 2013. 朝鮮 後期 通訊使 筆談 唱和集 翻譯 叢書 [Translation series on the brushtalk and poetry exchange by the envoys during the late Chosŏn period]. Paju-si, Gyeonggi-do: Bogosa.
- Kim, Hye-il 金惠一, Chang-hyun Jeong 丁彰炫, Woo-chang Jang 張祐彰 & You-sang Baik 白裕相. 2015. A content analysis of the medical conversation records from the visits of Joseontongshinsa - Focused on the medical classics - 朝鮮通信使 醫學 筆談錄 內容 分析 - 醫書 關聯 內用을 中心으로-. *Journal of Korean Medical Classics* 大韓韓醫學原典學會誌 28(4). 193–212.
- Koo, Jea Hyouon 具智賢. 2011. Exchanging books between Joseon and Japan as shown in the 17th century tongshinsa pildam 17世紀 通信使 筆談에 나타난 韓日間 書跡 交流의 모습. *韓國漢文學研究* [Studies in Korean Han Literature] 47. 527–551.
- Lee, Hye-sun 李慧淳. 1996. 朝鮮通信使의 文學 [The literature of the Chosŏn envoys]. Seoul: Ewha Womans University Press.
- Li, Swu-Kuang 李晔光. 2001 [1597]. 安南國使臣唱和問答錄 [Records of poetic exchange and interlocution with Vietnam ambassadors]. In Ki-cwung Lim 林基中 (ed.), 燕行錄全集 (卷十) [Complete works of *Yenhaynglok*], 127–160. Seoul: Tongkwuk Tayhakkyo Press.

YU, Thak-Ki 俞拓基. 2001 [1721]. Ciswucay Yenhaynglok 知守齋燕行錄. In Ki-Cwung Lim 林基中 (ed.), 燕行錄全集 (卷三十八) [Complete works of *Yenhaynglok*], 27–137. Seoul: Tongkuk Tayhakkyo Press.

References in Vietnamese:

- Lý, Xuân Chung 李春鐘. 2007. Về văn bản thơ xướng họa giữa Nguyễn Công Hãng (Việt Nam) với Du Tập Nhất, Lý Thế Cán (Hàn Quốc) trong chuyến đi sứ Trung Quốc năm 1718 [The poetry masterpieces between Nguyễn Công Hãng (Vietnam) and Du Tập Nhất, Lý Thế Cán (Chosŏn) when they visited China in 1718]. *Thông Báo Hán Nôm Học* [Announcement in Hán-Nôm Studies] <http://www.hannom.org.vn/detail.asp?param=1505&Catid=597> (accessed 26 November 2018).
- Lý, Xuân Chung 李春鐘. 2009. *Nghiên cứu, đánh giá thơ văn xướng họa của các sứ thần hai nước Việt Nam - Hàn Quốc* [A study of the poetry exchange between the Vietnam and Korean envoys]. Hà Nội: Institute of Hán-Nôm Studies PhD dissertation.
- Nguyễn, Minh Tường 阮明祥. 2009. Cuộc tiếp xúc giữa sứ thần Đại Việt Lê Quý Đôn và sứ thần Hàn Quốc Hồng Khải Hy, Triệu Vinh Tiên, Lý Huy Trung tại Bắc Kinh năm 1760 [The meeting between Lê Quý Đôn and Chosŏn envoys, Hồng Khải Hy, Triệu Vinh Tiên, Lý Huy Trung in 1760 in China]. *Tạp chí Hán Nôm* [Journal of Hán-Nôm] 2009(1). 3–17.
- Nguyễn, Thanh Tùng 阮青松. 2012. Giao hảo và cạnh tranh: Về cuộc hội ngộ giữa sứ thần Đại Việt và sứ thần Joseon trên Đất trung hoa năm 1766 – 1767 [Friendship and competition: On the meeting between the delegation of Đại Việt's envoys and the delegation of Joseon's envoys in 1766-1767 in China]. Paper presented at *Hội Thảo Khoa Học Quốc Tế 'Quan Hệ Việt Nam - Hàn Quốc: Quá Khứ, Hiện Tại Và Tương Lai'* [International Conference on Vietnam-Korea Relationship in the past, the present and the future], Sài Gòn, 1 December.
- Trịnh, Khắc Mạnh 鄭克孟 & Đức Toàn 阮德全. 2012. Thơ xướng họa của sứ thần Đại Việt - hoàng giáp Nguyễn Đăng với sứ thần Joseon - Lý Đầu Phong [The poetry masterpieces between the Vietnam envoy Nguyễn Đăng and the Chosŏn envoy Lý Đầu Phong]. *Tạp chí Hán Nôm* [Journal of Hán-Nôm] 2012(3). 3–10.
- Trịnh, Khắc Mạnh 鄭克孟 & Đức Toàn Nguyễn 阮德全. 2012. Thêm hai sứ thần Đại Việt có thơ xướng họa với sứ thần Joseon [Discover again the poetry masterpieces between two Vietnam envoys and Chosŏn envoys]. *Tạp chí Hán Nôm* [Journal of Hán-Nôm] 2012(5). 32–37.

Bio Notes

David C.S. Li has published in 'Hongkong English', 'China English', bilingual interaction and code-switching/translanguaging, multilingualism in Greater China, Chinese EFL errors and correction strategies, South Asian Hongkongers' needs for Cantonese and written Chinese. He speaks Cantonese, English and Putonghua/Mandarin fluently, is conversant in German and French, and is learning Korean.

李楚成的著作及研究範圍包括「香港英語」，中國英語，雙語對話及語碼轉換，大中華地區的多語狀況，華人學習英語時所面對的困難，常犯的英語文法錯處該如何糾正，以及南亞裔學生對廣東話及中文書面語的需要等。除了廣東話、英語和普通話之外，他能以純熟的法語和德語作口語及書面語的交流，並正在學習韓語。

Reijiro Aoyama's research has focused on Japanese studies, transnationalism and Japanese migrant communities in China and East Asia. His research interests include

economic anthropology, writing technology and education, and the relationship between language and commodification. He has conducted several long-term ethnographies of the Japanese presence in Shanghai, Guangzhou and Hong Kong, and has published on Japanese language education and Japanese diaspora in this region.

青山玲二郎的研究主要是涉及中國和東亞地區的日本研究、跨國主義及日本移民社區。他的研究興趣包括經濟人類學、寫作技術和教育、語言和商品化的關係等。他曾在上海、廣州和香港進行過數次長期民族誌，並發表了該地區關於日語教育和日本僑民的研究。

Tak-sum Wong is a post-doctoral fellow in the Department of Chinese and Bilingual Studies at the Hong Kong Polytechnic University. He received his BEng in Computer Science from HKUST in 2004 and his PhD in Linguistics from City University of Hong Kong in 2018. He has built a treebank of the *Tripitaka Koreana* during his doctoral studies and has been working on the quantitative study of historical syntax. His research interest covers Chinese historical linguistics, Cantonese linguistics, corpus linguistics, computer-assisted language learning, Chinese dialectology and Chinese paleography.

黃得森於香港理工大學中文及雙語學系任職博士後研究員。其於二零零四年在香港科技大學獲得計算機科學工學士，並於二零一八年在香港城市大學獲頒授語言學哲學博士。黃得森之博士研究以《高麗藏》為題，為其建構樹庫，並進行計量歷史語法學之研究。其研究興趣包括漢語歷史語言學、粵語語言學、語料庫、電腦輔助語言學習、漢語方言學和漢語文字學。